

# **BIOLOGICAL CRITERIA**

## ***Technical Guidance for Streams and Small Rivers***

### **Revised Edition**

#### *Project Leader and Editor*

Dr. George R. Gibson, Jr.  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Science and Technology  
Health and Ecological Criteria Division  
401 M Street, SW (4304)  
Washington, DC 20460

#### *Principal Authors*

Dr. Michael T. Barbour, Principal Scientist  
Dr. James B. Stribling, Senior Scientist  
Dr. Jeroen Gerritsen, Principal Scientist  
Tetra Tech, Inc.  
10045 Red Run Boulevard, Suite 110  
Owings Mill, MD 21117

Dr. James R. Karr, Director  
Institute for Environmental Studies  
Engineering Annex FM-12  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195

Prepared by JT&A, inc., and Abt Associates for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Points of view expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute an endorsement or recommendation for their use.

Address comments or suggestions related to this document to

Dr. George R. Gibson, Jr.  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Science and Technology  
Health and Ecological Criteria Division  
401 M Street, SW (4304)  
Washington, DC 20460

# Acknowledgments

**D**r. George Gibson of the Office of Science and Technology's Health and Ecological Criteria Division is project leader and main editor of this document whose principal authors are consultants Drs. Michael Barbour, James Stribling, Jeroen Gerritsen, and James Karr.

Dr. Phil Larsen of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Research Laboratory in Corvallis, Oregon; and Dr. David Courtemanch of the Department of Environmental Protection in Augusta, Maine, also provided valuable insights and wrote portions of the document. Staff from several program offices in the Office of Water provided expert advice and made comments on the text, and Rachel Reeder of JT&A, inc., helped weave the text with its multiple contributions into a more cogent document.

Many others also contributed to the writing of this document and deserve special thanks: first and foremost, the Streams Biocriteria Workgroup. The Workgroup, composed of state and EPA biologists, members of academic institutions, and other consultants, helped provide the framework for the basic approach and served as primary reviewers of the manuscript. Next, our special thanks to those scientists who responded to our request for peer review and to the members of the Ecological Processes and Effects Committee of the Science Advisory Board (SAB), who also reviewed the manuscript and prepared an insightful critique. We sincerely appreciate the contribution of their valuable time and constructive advice. Their comments have greatly improved the final document.

## **Streams Biocriteria Workgroup**

- George R. Gibson, Ph.D., Workgroup Chair, U.S. EPA Health and Ecological Criteria Division
- Michael Barbour, Ph.D., Tetra Tech, Inc.
- Edward Bender, Ph.D., U.S. EPA Science Advisory Board
- Lawrence Douglas, Ph.D., University of Maryland
- Chris Faulkner, U.S. EPA Assessment and Watershed Protection Division
- James Karr, Ph.D., University of Washington, Institute for Environmental Studies
- D. Phil Larsen, Ph.D., U.S. EPA Environmental Research Laboratory, Corvallis
- James Lazorchak, U.S. EPA Environmental Monitoring Systems Laboratory, Cincinnati
- Dave Penrose, North Carolina DEM, Environmental Services Laboratory
- James O. Peterson, Ph.D., University of Wisconsin
- Ron Preston, U.S. EPA Region 3, Wheeling Division
- Stephanie Sanzone, U.S. EPA Science Advisory Board
- Christopher Zarba, U.S. EPA Health and Ecological Criteria Division

# Contents

Acknowledgments .....	iii
List of Figures .....	viii
List of Tables .....	xi
<b>CHAPTER 1: Introduction</b> .....	1
The Concept of Biocriteria .....	2
Applications of Biocriteria .....	3
The Development, Validation, and Implementation Process for Biocriteria .....	4
Characteristics of Effective Biocriteria .....	9
Examples of Biocriteria .....	10
Narrative Biological Criteria .....	10
Numeric Biological Criteria .....	11
Other Biocriteria Reference Documents .....	12
Suggested Readings .....	13
<b>CHAPTER 2: Components of Biocriteria</b> .....	15
Conceptual Framework and Theory .....	15
Components of Biological Integrity .....	16
Assessing Biological Integrity .....	18
Complex Nature of Anthropogenic Impacts .....	19
The Biocriteria Development Process .....	21
Suggested Readings .....	25
<b>CHAPTER 3: The Reference Condition</b> .....	27
Establishing the Reference Condition .....	27
The Use of Reference Sites .....	29
Characterizing Reference Conditions .....	32
Classification .....	32
Framework for Preliminary Classification .....	33
Site Selection .....	39
Confirming Reference Conditions — Successful Classifications .....	41
Suggested Readings .....	44
<b>CHAPTER 4: Conducting the Biosurvey</b> .....	45
Quality Assurance Planning .....	46
Quality Management .....	47
Biocriteria Program Structure, Personnel, and Resources .....	47
Quality Control Elements in an Ecological Study .....	50
Data Quality Objectives .....	54
Study Design .....	55

Biosurveys of Targeted Assemblages .....	56
Attributes of Selected Assemblages .....	56
Synthesis .....	59
Technical Issues .....	60
Selection of the Proper Sampling Periods .....	61
Selection of Habitat for Aquatic Assemblage Evaluations .....	67
Standardization of Techniques .....	72
Sample Collection .....	72
Sample Processing .....	73
Suggested Readings .....	74
<b>CHAPTER 5: Evaluating Environmental Effects .....</b>	<b>77</b>
Water Quality .....	77
Habitat Structure .....	81
Habitat Quality and Biological Condition .....	82
Development of Habitat Assessment Approach .....	83
Flow Regime .....	85
Energy Source .....	88
Biotic Interactions .....	90
Cumulative Impacts .....	90
Suggested Readings .....	91
<b>CHAPTER 6: Multimetric Approaches for Biocriteria Development .....</b>	<b>93</b>
Metric Evaluation and Calibration .....	94
Biocriteria Based on a Multimetric Approach .....	97
Potential Metrics for Fish and Macroinvertebrates .....	102
Index Development .....	106
Multivariate Approaches .....	109
Suggested Readings .....	109
<b>CHAPTER 7: Biocriteria Development and Implementation .....</b>	<b>111</b>
Establishing Regional Biocriteria .....	111
Designing the Actual Criterion .....	112
Biocriteria for Significantly Impacted Areas .....	114
Selecting the Assessment Site .....	114
Evaluating the Assessment Site .....	116
Overview of Selected State Biocriteria Programs .....	119
Costs for State Programs Developing Bioassessments and Biocriteria .....	124
Value of Biocriteria in Assessing Impairment .....	128
Suggested Readings .....	132
<b>CHAPTER 8: Applications of the Biocriteria Process .....</b>	<b>133</b>
Stream Characterization and Classification .....	133
Case Study — North Carolina .....	133
Refining Aquatic Life Uses .....	135
Judging Use Impairment .....	136
Case Study — Ohio .....	137
Diagnosing Impairment Causes .....	138

Case Study — Delaware .....	139
Problem Identification .....	141
Case Study — Maine .....	141
Other Applications of the Process .....	142
Suggested Readings .....	144
Contacts for Case Studies .....	144
<b>Glossary</b> .....	145
<b>References</b> .....	151

# *List of Figures*

Figure 1-1.—Model for biocriteria development and application. ....	6
Figure 2-1.—Conceptual model showing the interrelationships of the primary variables relative to the integrity of an aquatic biota. External refers to features outside the stream system; internal to in-stream features (Karr, 1991). Terrestrial environment includes factors such as geology, topography, soil, and vegetation. ....	20
Figure 2-2.—Organizational structure of the attributes that should be incorporated into biological assessments. ....	21
Figure 3-1.—Approach to establishing reference conditions. ....	30
Figure 3-2.—Reciprocal averaging ordination of sites by fish species in the Calapooia River watershed, Oregon. The inset shows the correspondence between fish assemblages in the rivers and ecoregions. ....	37
Figure 3-3.—Generalized box-and-whisker plots illustrating percentiles and the detection coefficient of metrics. ....	41
Figure 3-4.—Index of Biotic Integrity at Ohio reference sites. ....	43
Figure 3-5.—Fish species richness as a function of the log of watershed area. Bars to right indicate range of observations before regression and range of residuals after regression. Residuals have smaller variance than the original observations. ....	43
Figure 4-1.—Organization chart illustrating project organization and lines of responsibility. ....	50
Figure 4-2.—Summary of Data Quality Objective (DQO) process for ecological studies (taken from Barbour and Thornley, 1990). ....	54
Figure 4-3.—Classification of U.S. climatological regions. ....	63
Figure 4-4.—Biological and hydrological factors for sampling period selection in the Northeast (macroinvertebrates). The gray area is the overlap between emergence and recruitment. ....	65
Figure 4-5.—Biological and hydrological factors for sampling period selection in the Northeast (fish). ....	66
Figure 5-1.—Five major classes of environmental factors that affect aquatic biota in lotic systems. Right column lists selected expected results of anthropogenic perturbation (Karr et al. 1986). ....	78
Figure 5-2.—Decision matrix for application of rapid bioassessments in Arkansas for permitted point source discharges (Shackleford, 1988). ....	80
Figure 5-3.—Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI) versus Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) for 465 relatively unimpacted and habitat modified Ohio stream sites (Rankin, 1991). ....	83
Figure 5-4.—Choptank and Chester rivers tributaries (Primrose et al. 1991). ....	83

Figure 5-5.—Relationship of the Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) to changes in the quality of habitat structure through the Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI) in channelized (triangles) and unchannelized (circles) (Ohio EPA, 1990). . . . .	86
Figure 5-6.—Diagrammatic representation of the stream continuum to illustrate variation in trophic structure of benthic invertebrates (adapted from Cummins, 1983). . . . .	89
Figure 5-7.—Biological community response as portrayed by the Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) in four similarly sized Ohio rivers with different types of point and nonpoint source impacts (Yoder, 1991). . . . .	91
Figure 6-1a.—Metrics that decrease with impairment. . . . .	94
Figure 6-1b.—Metrics that increase with impairment. . . . .	95
Figure 6-2.—Total number of fish species versus stream order for 72 sites along the Embarras River in Illinois (Fausch et al. 1984). . . . .	96
Figure 6-3.—Metrics plotted with a continuous covariate (hypothetical example). . . . .	96
Figure 6-4.—Box and whisker plots of metric values from hypothetical stream classes. Shaded portions are above the median for each class. The box represents a percentile, the vertical line is 1.5 times the interquartile range, and the horizontal line is the median of each distribution. . . . .	97
Figure 6-5a.—Site discrimination for the number of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Trichoptera (EPT index) in Florida streams. (Reference = least impaired, other = unknown, impaired = determined impaired a priori.) . . . . .	98
Figure 6-5b.—Site discrimination for the number of Chironomidae taxa in Florida streams. (Reference = least impaired, other = unknown, impaired = determined impaired a priori.) . . . . .	98
Figure 6-6.—Tiered metric development process (adapted from Holland, 1990). . . . .	99
Figure 6-7.—The conceptual process for proceeding from measurements to indicators to assessment condition (modified from Paulsen et al. 1991). . . . .	100
Figure 6-8.—Invertebrate stream index scores for Florida streams. . . . .	108
Figure 7-1.—Hierarchy of statistical models used in Maine's biological criteria program (taken from Davies et al. 1993). . . . .	113
Figure 7-2.—The process for proceeding from measurements of fish assemblage to indicators such as the Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) or Index of Well Being (IWB) — as used to develop criteria and apply those criteria to streams (modified from Paulsen et al. 1991). . . . .	118
Figure 7-3a.—Biological criteria in the Ohio WQS for the Warmwater Habitat (WWH) and Exceptional Warmwater Habitat (EWH) use designations arranged by biological index, site type for fish, and ecoregion (Ohio EPA, 1992). . . . .	124
Figure 7-3b.—Biological criteria in the Ohio WQS for the Modified Warmwater Habitat (MWH) use designation arranged by biological index, site type for fish, modification type, and ecoregion (Ohio EPA, 1992). . . . .	125
Figure 7-4.—Comparison of ambient toxicity and fish richness surveys at eight sites in various parts of the United States (taken from U.S. EPA, 1991). . . . .	129



Figure 7-5.—Comparison of effluent toxicity of receiving water impact using <i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i> chronic toxicity tests and freshwater receiving stream benthic invertebrates at 43 point source discharging sites in North Carolina (taken from U.S. EPA, 1991). . . . .	130
Figure 7-6.—Comparison of chemical criteria exceedances and biosurvey results at 645 stream segments in Ohio. . . . .	130
Figure 7-7.—Assessment of nontidal stream aquatic life use attainment in Delaware (taken from the state's 395[b] report, 1994). . . . .	131
Figure 8-1.—EPT Index (number of taxa of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Trichoptera) for two locations on the South Fork of the New River, North Carolina. . . . .	134
Figure 8-2.—Examples from some states using biological assessments to determine aquatic life use support in rivers and streams. Failure to sustain fish and aquatic life is defined with respect to the reference condition in that state. . . . .	136
Figure 8-3.—Temporal trends in the improvement of the Upper Hocking River 1982 - 1990. . . . .	138
Figure 8-4.—Assessment summary, Kent and Sussex counties, Delaware, 1991 . . . . .	140
Figure 8-5.—State of Delaware 1994 305(b) report, aquatic life use attainment — all nontidal streams. . . . .	140
Figure 8-6.—Macroinvertebrates in the Piscataquis River, Maine, 1984 - 1990. . . . .	143

# List of Tables

Table 2-1.— Components of biological integrity (modified from Karr, 1990). . . . .	17
Table 3-1.— Hierarchical classification of stream riparian habitats (from Minshall, 1993; after Frissell et al. 1986). . . . .	36
Table 4-1.— Quality control elements integral to activities in an ecological study in sequence. . . . .	51
Table 4-2.— Common benthic habitats. . . . .	70
Table 4-3.— Proposed minimal levels of taxonomic resolution for stream macroinvertebrates (taken from Sci. Advis. Board, 1993). . . . .	74
Table 5-1.— Parameters that may be useful in evaluating environmental conditions and their relationship to geographic scales and the environmental factors influenced by human actions. . . . .	82
Table 6-1.— Sequential progression of the biocriteria process. . . . .	101
Table 6-2.— Index of Biotic Integrity metrics used in various regions of North America. . . . .	103
Table 6-3.— Examples of metric suites used for analysis of macroinvertebrate assemblages. . . . .	104
Table 6-4.— Index of Biotic Integrity metrics and scoring criteria based on fish community data from more than 300 reference sites throughout Ohio applicable only to boat (i.e., nonwadable) sites. Table modified from Ohio EPA (1987). . . . .	107
Table 6-5.— Ranges for Index of Biological Integrity values representing different narrative descriptions of fish assemblage condition in Ohio streams. Site category descriptions — wading, boat, and headwaters — indicate the type of site and style of sampling done at those sites. Modified from Ohio EPA (1987). . . . .	108
Table 7-1.— Sequential process for assessment of test sites and determination of the relationship to established biocriteria. . . . .	117
Table 7-2.— Maine's water quality classification system for rivers and streams, with associated biological standards (taken from Davies et al. 1993). . . . .	120
Table 7-3.— Bioclassification criteria scores for EPT taxa richness values for three North Carolina ecoregions based on two sampling methods. . . . .	122
Table 7-4.— The investment of state water resource agency staff to develop bioassessment programs as a framework for biocriteria. . . . .	128
Table 7-5.— Costs associated with retaining consultants to develop bioassessment programs as a framework for biocriteria. Dash indicates work done by state employees or information not available; FTE costs for contractors and state employees are not equivalent. . . . .	128